

REMARKS

Claims 5-39 are pending in this application, with claims 5, 10, 13, 18, 23, 29 and 34 being independent. Claims 10, 13, 18, 23, 29 and 34 have been amended for clarity. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-26, 28-31, 33-37 and 39 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,265,833) in view of Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,629). With respect to claim 5 and its dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Kim, Yamada, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a voltage changer electrically connected to the EL element of each of the plurality of pixels via a switch, and also connected to an EL driving power source, as recited in claim 5.

Recognizing that Kim does not describe or suggest a voltage changer electrically connected to the EL element of each of the plurality of pixels via a switch, the rejection points to Yamada as showing such a connection. In particular, paragraph 7 of the rejection indicates that S1, S2 and 101 of Fig. 22 of Yamada correspond to the voltage changer, and that the power source Ps corresponds to the recited EL driving power source. This interpretation is not understood since, if S1, S2 and 101 all correspond to the “voltage changer”, then it is unclear how this “voltage changer” would be connected to the EL element of each of the pixels via a switch, since there is no additional element to correspond to the switch and since element 101 is an EL element. Similarly, if S2 of Yamada is said to correspond to the recited “switch,” then it is unclear what would constitute the recited “voltage changer,” since the power source Ps cannot be both the voltage changer and the EL driving power source. Thus, since neither Kim (as acknowledged by the Examiner) nor Yamada (as set forth above) describes or suggests a voltage changer that is connected to an EL driving power source and is also electrically connected to the EL elements of a plurality of pixels via a switch, any proper combination of the references would also fail to include such a voltage changer. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 5 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.  
Serial No. : 09/752,817  
Filed : January 3, 2001  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-003001 / US4564

Like claim 5, each of independent claims 10, 13, 18, 23, 29 and 34 recites a voltage changer that is connected to an EL driving power source and is also electrically connected to the EL elements of a plurality of pixels via a switch. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims, and their dependent claims, for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 6, 11, 16, 21, 27, 32 and 38 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Yamada and Poulton (U.S. Patent No. 5,702,323). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Poulton does not remedy the failure of Kim and Yamada to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$1240.00 check (\$790.00 for the RCE fee and \$450.00 for the Two-Month Extension of Time). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/22/05

**Customer No. 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331  
JFH/adt  
40276713.doc

  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640